



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/237,646	01/26/1999	VITTORIO CASTELLI	YO998-220	7219
7590 04/06/2006 ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY 3173 CEDAR ROD YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598			EXAMINER TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/237,646

Applicant(s)

CASTELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8, 13-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-12 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 18) in the reply filed on 1/3/2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 18 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 9-12 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Liddy does not teach the claimed limitation of claims 1 and 9.

In response: As to claims 1 and 9, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first searching said database to retrieve data based on said query" as the user enters a query, possibly a natural language query, the system processes the query to generate an alternative representation query, this query representation is matched to the relevant document database and measures of relevance generated for the document (col. 2, lines 48-50; col. 28, lines 15-40);

"presenting retrieved data to a user" as presenting retrieved documents to the user (col. 28, lines 30-35);

"receiving user input based on said user input based on said retrieved data" as the user select retrieved documents, if the user has marked document deemed by the user to be particularly relevant, the user can invoke the more-like-marked feature, which causes the query representation to be modified in view of the documents and the

Art Unit: 2162

refined query to be rerun. The above information shows that the system has received user's input based on retrieved documents (col. 28, lines 30-40);

"transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transformed database" as after receiving user's input, the refined query to be rerun. Matcher 55 matches documents by comparing the documents with the query and assigning each document with a similarity score for the query. The matcher determines the similarity between query and documents. The above information shows that each document is converted by changing similarity measure of each document (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35);

"wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database" as the matching score between the query and document is determined the correlation or association between them, which is computed by a similarity measure that treats the query and document vectors as two data points in the multi-dimensional space and then computes the distance between these two data points. The above information shows that the transforming of each document comprises changing distance/similarity measure with the document for the refined query or each time user's input (col. 23, lines 1-32; col. 21, lines 25-67);

"successively searching said transformed database to retrieved data" as the output of the matcher is a ranked lists of documents assigned to folder and the rank

position of a document with each folder is determined by a similarity score computed in DR-Link matcher (col. 33, lines 4-10);

“repeating steps b through e until the results for the said query is satisfied” as (figs. 9A-9B, col. 28, lines 10-42).

For the above reason, examiner believed Liddy teaches the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 9-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liddy et al (or hereinafter “Liddy”) (US 5963940).

As to claims 1 and 9, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

“a first searching said database to retrieve data based on said query” as the user enters a query, possibly a natural language query, the system processes the query to generate an alternative representation query, this query representation is matched to the relevant document database and measures of relevance generated for the document (col. 2, lines 48-50; col. 28, lines 15-40);

“presenting retrieved data to a user” as presenting retrieved documents to the user (col. 28, lines 30-35);

“receiving user input based on said user input based on said retrieved data” as the user select retrieved documents, if the user has marked document deemed by the user to be particularly relevant, the user can invoke the more-like-marked feature, which causes the query representation to be modified in view of the documents and the refined query to be rerun. The above information shows that the system has received user’s input based on retrieved documents (col. 28, lines 30-40);

“transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transformed database” as after receiving user’s input, the refined query to be rerun. Matcher 55 matches documents by comparing the documents with the query and assigning each document with a similarity score for the query. The matcher determines the similarity between query and documents. The above information shows that each document is converted by changing similarity measure of each document (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35);

“wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database” as the matching score between the query and document is determined the correlation or association between them, which is computed by a similarity measure that treats the query and document vectors as two data points in the multi-dimensional space and then computes the distance between these two data

Art Unit: 2162

points. The above information shows that the transforming of each document comprises changing distance/similarity measure with the document for the refined query or each time user's input (col. 23, lines 1-32; col. 21, lines 25-67);

"successively searching said transformed database to retrieved data" as the output of the matcher is a ranked lists of documents assigned to folder and the rank position of a document with each folder is determined by a similarity score computed in DR-Link matcher (col. 33, lines 4-10);

"repeating steps b through e until the results for the said query is satisfied" as (figs. 9A-9B, col. 28, lines 10-42).

As to claims 2 and 10, Liddy teaches the claimed limitation "reformulating the query based on user input and wherein said searching said transformed database comprises searching said transformed database based on said reformulated query (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35).

As to claim 18, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a search component for searching said database to retrieve data based on said query" as the user enters a query, possibly a natural language query, the system processes the query to generate an alternative representation query, this query representation is matched to the relevant document database and measures of relevance generated for the document (col. 2, lines 48-50; col. 28, lines 15-40);

“a representation component for presenting retrieval data to user” as presenting retrieved documents to the user (col. 28, lines 30-35);

“a receiver component for receiving user input based on said retrieval data” as the user select retrieved documents, if the user has marked document deemed by the user to be particularly relevant, the user can invoke the more-like-marked feature, which causes the query representation to be modified in view of the documents and the refined query to be rerun. The above information shows that the system has received user's input based on retrieved documents (col. 28, lines 30-40);

“a transformation component for transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transform database” as after receiving user's input, the refined query to be rerun. Matcher 55 matches documents by comparing the documents with the query and assigning each document with a similarity score for the query. The matcher determines the similarity between query and documents. The above information shows that each document is converted by changing similarity measure of each document (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35);

“wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database” as the matching score between the query and document is determined the correlation or association between them, which is computed by a similarity measure that treats the query and document vectors as two data points in the multi-dimensional space and then computes the distance between these two data

Art Unit: 2162

points. The above information shows that the transforming of each document comprises changing distance/similarity measure with the document for the refined query or each time user's input (col. 23, lines 1-32; col. 21, lines 25-67);

"wherein said system successively searches said transformed database to retrieve data and present retrieved data to the user until the query is satisfied" as (figs. 9A-9B, col. 28, lines 10-42).

4. Claims 1, 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by De Bonet (or herein after "De") (US 5852823).

As to claims 1 and 9, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first searching said database to retrieve data based on said query" as (col. 22, lines 45-60);

"presenting retrieved data to a user" as (col. 22, lines 45-60);

"receiving user input based on said user input based on said retrieved data" as (col. 22, lines 60-67);

"transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transformed database" as (col. 22, lines 60-67; col. 23, lines 1-7; col. 12, lines 55-60);

"wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database" as (col. 22, lines 60-67; col. 23, lines 1-7; col. 12, lines 55-60; col. 12, lines 55-60; col. 13, lines 15-45);

“successively searching said transformed database to retrieved data” as (col. 23, lines 1-15);

“repeating steps b through e until the results for the said query is satisfied” as (col. 23, lines 1-15; col. 15, lines 1-7).

As to claim 18, De teaches the claimed limitations:

“a search component for searching said database to retrieve data based on said query” as (col. 22, lines 45-60);

“a representation component for presenting retrieval data to user” as (col. 22, lines 45-60);

“a receiver component for receiving user input based on said retrieval data” as (col. 22, lines 60-67);

“a transformation component for transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transform database” as (col. 22, lines 60-67; col. 23, lines 1-7; col. 12, lines 55-60);

“wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database” as (col. 22, lines 60-67; col. 23, lines 1-7; col. 12, lines 55-60; col. 12, lines 55-60; col. 13, lines 15-45);

"wherein said system successively searches said transformed database to retrieve data and present retrieved data to the user until the query is satisfied" as (col. 23, lines 1-15; col. 15, lines 1-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 9-10 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Jain et al (or hereinafter "Jain") (US 5983237).

As to claims 1 and 9, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first searching said database to retrieve data based on said query" as the user enters a query, possibly a natural language query, the system processes the query to generate an alternative representation query, this query representation is matched to the relevant document database and measures of relevance generated for the document (col. 2, lines 48-50; col. 28, lines 15-40);

"presenting retrieved data to a user" as presenting retrieved documents to the user (col. 28, lines 30-35);

"receiving user input based on said user input based on said retrieved data" as the user select retrieved documents, if the user has marked document deemed by the user to be particularly relevant, the user can invoke the more-like-marked feature, which

causes the query representation to be modified in view of the documents and the refined query to be rerun. The above information shows that the system has received user's input based on retrieved documents (col. 28, lines 30-40);

"transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transformed database" as after receiving user's input, the refined query to be rerun. Matcher 55 matches documents by comparing the documents with the query and assigning each document with a similarity score for the query. The matcher determines the similarity between query and documents. The above information shows that each document is converted by changing similarity measure of each document (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35);

"wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database" as the matching score between the query and document is determined by the correlation or association between them, which is computed by a similarity measure that treats the query and document vectors as two data points in the multi-dimensional space and then computes the distance between these two data points. The above information shows that the transforming of each document comprises changing distance/similarity measure with the document for the refined query or each time user's input (col. 23, lines 1-32; col. 21, lines 25-67);

"successively searching said transformed database to retrieved data" as the output of the matcher is a ranked lists of documents assigned to folder and the rank

position of a document with each folder is determined by a similarity score computed in DR-Link matcher (col. 33, lines 4-10);

“repeating steps b through e until the results for the said query is satisfied” as (figs. 9A-9B, col. 28, lines 10-42).

Liddy does not explicitly the claimed limitation “retrieving multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query”. Jain teaches retrieving image as multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query (col. 4, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Jain’s teaching of retrieving image as multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query to Liddy’s system in order to retrieves a large number of image in a database corresponding user’s desire.

As to claims 2 and 10, Liddy teaches the claimed limitation “reformulating the query based on user input and wherein said searching said transformed database comprises searching said transformed database based on said reformulated query (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35).

As to claim 18, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

“a search component for searching said database to retrieve data based on said query” as the user enters a query, possibly a natural language query, the system processes the query to generate an alternative representation query, this query

Art Unit: 2162

representation is matched to the relevant document database and measures of relevance generated for the document (col. 2, lines 48-50; col. 28, lines 15-40);

"a representation component for presenting retrieval data to user" as presenting retrieved documents to the user (col. 28, lines 30-35);

"a receiver component for receiving user input based on said retrieval data" as the user select retrieved documents, if the user has marked document deemed by the user to be particularly relevant, the user can invoke the more-like-marked feature, which causes the query representation to be modified in view of the documents and the refined query to be rerun. The above information shows that the system has received user's input based on retrieved documents (col. 28, lines 30-40);

"a transformation component for transforming said database based on said user input to generate a transform database" as after receiving user's input, the refined query to be rerun. Matcher 55 matches documents by comparing the documents with the query and assigning each document with a similarity score for the query. The matcher determines the similarity between query and documents. The above information shows that each document is converted by changing similarity measure of each document (col. 28, lines 30-40; col. 21, lines 25-67; col. 22, lines 1-35);

"wherein said transforming comprises at least one of modifying a linear transform matrix of the database, transforming the feature space of the database, changing distance/similarity measures within said database, and changing weighting features within said database" as the matching score between the query and document is determined the correlation or association between them, which is computed by a

Art Unit: 2162

similarity measure that treats the query and document vectors as two data points in the multi-dimensional space and then computes the distance between these two data points. The above information shows that the transforming of each document comprises changing distance/similarity measure with the document for the refined query or each time user's input (col. 23, lines 1-32; col. 21, lines 25-67);

"wherein said system successively searches said transformed database to retrieve data and present retrieved data to the user until the query is satisfied" as (figs. 9A-9B, col. 28, lines 10-42).

Liddy does not explicitly the claimed limitation "retrieving multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query". Jain teaches retrieving image as multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query (col. 4, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Jain's teaching of retrieving image as multidimensional data from a database in response to a user query to Liddy's system in order to retrieves a large number of image in a database corresponding user's desire.

7. Claims 3-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Jain et al (or hereinafter "Jain") and further in view of Kirsch et al (or hereinafter "Kirsch") (US 5845278).

As to claims 3 and 11, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting indices from said database and wherein said searching is preceded by retrieving indices to focus said search on indexed information in said database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to Liddy's system in order to provide an efficient and effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

As to claims 4 and 12, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "applying said extracted indexes to said transformed database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the

Art Unit: 2162

indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used or apply to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to Liddy's system in order to provide an efficient and effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

8. Claims 3-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Kirsch et al (or hereinafter "Kirsch") (US 5845278).

As to claims 3 and 11, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting indices from said database and wherein said searching is preceded by retrieving indices to focus said search on indexed information in said database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to Liddy's system in order to provide an efficient and effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

As to claims 4 and 12, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "applying said extracted indexes to said transformed database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used or apply to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to Liddy's system in order to provide an efficient and

Art Unit: 2162

effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

9. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bonet (US 5852823) in view of Jain et al (or hereinafter "Jain") (US 5983237).

As to claims 2 and 10, De teaches the claimed limitation "reformulating the query based on user input and wherein said searching said transformed database comprises searching said transformed database based on said reformulated query".

Jain teaches sends refinement parameters based on user input to a query refinement for modification of a query. The query refinement processor may send a new query structure for refinement of the database query to query processor to produce a new set of query results (col. 4, lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Jain's teaching of sends refinement parameters based on user input to a query refinement for modification of a query. The query refinement processor may send a new query structure for refinement of the database query to query processor to produce a new set of query results to De's system in order to improve the performance of retrieving visual information from a database by provide the most relevance document to user's request.

Art Unit: 2162

10. Claims 3-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De in view of Jain et al (or hereinafter "Jain") (US 5983237) and further in view of Kirsch et al (or hereinafter "Kirsch") (US 5845278).

As to claims 3 and 11, De does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting indices from said database and wherein said searching is preceded by retrieving indices to focus said search on indexed information in said database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to De's system in order to provide an efficient and effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

As to claims 4 and 12, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "applying said extracted indexes to said transformed database".

Kirsch teaches the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes. The above information shows that indexes are retrieved for transported over the Internet and are used or apply to search the collections 88, 90 and 92 (fig. 5, col. 14, lines 62-67; col. 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kirsch's teaching of the individual collection indexes are transported over the Internet 86 to a meta index processor 106. The indexes are utilized with accesses of the collections 88, 90 and 92 and searching the collections 88, 90 and 92 based on the indexes to De's system in order to provide an efficient and effective method for searching the most relevant information database based on indexes.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162
4/3/2006